

"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."—CHRIST.

The Christian Freeman.

A MONTHLY JOURNAL.

DEVOTED TO RELIGIOUS, MORAL, AND SOCIAL PROGRESS.

No. 7.]

JULY, 1861.

[PRICE 1½d.

REV. THEOPHILUS LINDSEY.

AN EXAMPLE FOR CHURCHMEN.

THE present age, we are justified in saying, abounds with clergymen who are persuaded that they are bound by creed-fetters they have not courage to strike off. Of all deplorable spectacles, the most melancholy is that of a gospel minister afraid to make a sacrifice for the sake of his most enlightened convictions. We cannot but commend the study of the lives of men, whose decision, honesty, and faithfulness are needed now.

At the head of the list stands Rev. Theophilus Lindsey. Mr. Lindsey was born at Middlewich, in Cheshire, June 20th, 1723. He was named after his godfather, Theophilus, Earl of Huntingdon, the husband of Salina, Countess of Huntingdon, so well known as the zealous and liberal patroness of Whitfield and the Calvinistic Methodists. At a proper age he was placed in the Grammar School, at Leeds, then under the superintendence of Mr. Barnard. To the instructions and influences to which he was here subjected, in concurrence with the impressions of his earlier domestic education, Mr. Lindsey was indebted for that ardent love of truth, that firm integrity, that purity of spirit, that early and deeply rooted principle, by which he was so eminently distinguished. At the eighteenth year of his age Mr. L. was admitted at St. John's College, Cambridge. Here his literary attainments and exemplary conduct soon attracted general notice and admiration. Having passed through his academical course, and taken his degree with high reputation, Mr. Lindsey was elected a fellow of St. John's College; and, had he cho-

sen to devote himself to literary pursuits, he was well qualified to have attained considerable distinction, but his chief ambition was to be a minister of the Gospel. After several changes, he succeeded to the living of Pindletown, in Dorsetshire. While he was minister of this parish, he married, September 29th, 1760, Miss Elsworth, the step-daughter of Archdeacon Blackburne, the celebrated author of "The Confessional;" a lady whose principles and views were congenial with his own; whose superior understanding and exalted virtues were eminently calculated to aid and second him in all his schemes for the temporal and spiritual benefit of his parishioners, and especially of the poor and ignorant.

It was while Mr. Lindsey resided at Pindletown that he first began to entertain serious scruples concerning the Scripture warrant for Trinitarian worship, and the lawfulness of his continuing to officiate in the Established Church. After learned, calm, and diligent inquiries, he says, "the more I searched, the more I saw the little foundation there was for the doctrine commonly received and interwoven with all the public devotions of the Church, and could not be disturbed at a discovery so ill suiting my situation. For, in the end, I became fully persuaded, to use Paul's express words, 1 Cor. viii. 6.—'That there is but one God, the Father,' and he alone to be worshipped. This appeared to be the uniform, unvaried language and practice of the Bible throughout; and I found the sentiments and practice of Christians in the first and best ages corresponding with it." Mr. Lindsey did not, however, immediately leave the Church; an affair of such moment required, he thought, and rightly, much and mature consideration. At the same

time he declined an offer which, in all probability, would have led him to the Episcopal bench of the Church of Ireland. Mr. Lindsey was greatly desirous of residing in Yorkshire, where he might enjoy the society and counsel of many valuable friends, and particularly of the venerable Archdeacon Blackburne. He accordingly exchanged his living for that of Catterick, a benefice in every respect inferior to that of Pindletown. Mr. Lindsey had now renounced the doctrine of the Trinity; yet he remained in the Church. He himself has stated the reasons. He had been devoted to, and early educated for the Christian ministry; his heart was engaged in the service, and he was reluctant to leave a situation of usefulness. This reluctance was increased, and its impropriety rendered less evident, by the silence which prevailed respecting Unitarianism—the singularity of quitting the Church on such grounds—the example of other estimable persons who, though their opinions varied little from his, satisfied themselves to remain in the Church—the dissuasion of friends, who told him that he ought not to leave his benefice merely, but the world, if he expected a perfect state of things in which there was no flaw or hardship; and that, in the meantime, he had it in his power to forward the desired work, by preparing men's minds for it, whenever there should be a disposition in state to rectify what was amiss. If therefore he could find any way of interpretation, so as to reconcile the prescribed forms with Scripture, he was not only justified, but to be commended. These considerations influenced him, and he brought himself to consider the Trinitarian forms in the service, as a threefold representation of the one God. This hypothesis was advanced by the learned Dr. Wallis, and sanctioned by the University of Oxford. He took all opportunities, however, both in public and private, to bear his testimony to this great truth—that there is but one God the Father—with great plainness, and without reserve. However plausible these arguments, they were not likely to maintain a permanent ascendancy over the honourable, ingenuous, and inquiring mind of this excellent man; and in his apology for resigning

his living in the Church, he frankly, and with great humility, acknowledges their invalidity and his own infirmity in yielding to them.

At length he resolved to quit the Church communion, though he expected that his means of usefulness would be greatly diminished, if not annihilated; though his principles and person would, among the great body of the dissenters, be regarded with horror; and few were the congregations, at that time of day, though they called themselves rational and liberal, who would endure to hear the pure Unitarian doctrine. But none of these things moved him; he fixed his eye upon the line of duty, and determined closely to adhere to it, and to leave the event to God. On announcing his resolution to his friends, the most dear and intimate opposed it at the most; they urged upon him the state of poverty to which he would reduce himself and family; but in vain. In obedience to the voice of enlightened conscience, Mr. and Mrs. Lindsey resigned their beloved residence at Catterick, with all its secular advantages and comforts; with all its means of usefulness; and with the smallest pittance of private property, set out in the bleak month of December in search of a resting-place, where they might be able to maintain themselves by honourable industry, and might best promote the great doctrine of the Divine Unity, and the sole and unrivalled supremacy of the Father.

“The world was all before them, where to choose
Their place of rest; and Providence their
guide.”

The diminution of their income was not their only difficulty. Former friends looked coldly on them, and some from whom better things might have been expected, were not sparing in loud and strong expressions of disapprobation; and not a few willing to leave them to their fate. Some, indeed, of Mrs. Lindsey's more opulent relations, offered to provide for her an asylum and competence, if she would abandon the society and the fortunes of her husband. It is needless to say that such a proposal was rejected with the indignation it deserved. As a means of temporary supply, Mr. Lindsey sold his library—a sacrifice—the value of which none can appreciate,

but those who have an ingenious love of literature. It was now that Mr. Lindsey published his Apology. The design of this excellent treatise, as set forth in the preface, "was not barely to offer a vindication of the motives, conduct, and sentiments of a private person upon the subject of it, however important to him, but to promote that charity, without which a faith that can remove mountains is nothing, and to excite some to piety, virtue, and integrity." Arrived in London, they provided themselves with humble lodgings, and sold their plate to purchase necessaries for their subsistence.

But the scene began to brighten. Assistance was afforded; and a room was taken in Essex House, Essex-street, which was fitted up as a temporary chapel. Dr. Priestley and Dr. Price were indefatigable in their endeavours to promote the cause in which Mr. L. was embarked, and they kindly offered to indemnify our venerable confessor. When it became generally known that he intended to open a chapel upon principles strictly Unitarian, great offence was taken by many; and means were used, but without effect, to intimidate this magnanimous man from the execution of his purpose. It was even intimated to him that the civil powers would interpose to frustrate his design. Though, however, upon the opening of the Chapel, an emissary of the Government was known for some time to attend the public service regularly, in order to communicate information to persons in power, yet when it was discovered that nothing was either taught or done contrary to the allegiance due to the state, ministers wisely ceased to trouble themselves about Essex-street Chapel. On Sunday, April 17, 1774, the Chapel was opened, and divine service performed before an audience as numerous as could in reason be expected, and as respectable for rank and character as was ever collected upon a similar occasion. The cause soon began to flourish beyond all expectation. The chapel was always crowded with attentive hearers, so that many who came late, were obliged to go away for want of room. Considerable numbers of names of great respectability were continually given in as subscribers to the expense of the Chapel, and to

the support of the minister. Several pamphlets now issued from the press, animadverting on the views which Mr. L. had adopted, and vindicating the doctrines and rites of the Church. This gave rise to the Apology—the most elaborate of Mr. L.'s publications. As the congregation increased, and the interest appeared likely to be permanent, it became necessary to provide a suitable place of worship. It was agreed, therefore, to purchase the premises in Essex-street: this was accomplished; and they were fitted up in their present commodious form for the purpose of a chapel, and for a residence for Mr. Lindsey. From this period, Mr. L. may be considered as fully settled. All difficulties were completely removed. Everything went on comparatively in a smooth, easy, and equable tenor; and the succeeding years of his life were not more diversified than those of other studious persons and ministers commonly are. Mr. Lindsey was in general blessed with a good share of health, and a natural and equal flow of good spirits. His circumstances, if not affluent, were, at least, easy and comfortable. His friends were numerous; and he was in the habit of daily, and familiar, and delightful intercourse with persons of the highest respectability for rank, talent, character, and information. His public services were attended by as large a congregation as the chapel would admit, all of whom revered and loved their venerable pastor; and listened to his words as though he were an apostle of Christ. He was engaged in an office to himself the most delightful, and to others the most instructive and edifying; at full liberty to search the Scriptures without any control, and to speak his sentiments without the least reserve, to a people, candid, affectionate, and warmly prepossessed in favour of whatever he addressed to them. If ever any person resigned a situation of ease and affluence, from principles the most pure and disinterested, with expectations the most humble, and with prospects the most gloomy and uninviting, it was Mr. Lindsey. And if any persons ever experienced the accomplishment of the evangelical promise, that he who should voluntarily forsake all for Christ and for his Word, should even in the present life receive

remuneration a hundred-fold, Mr. L. was the man. Of this mark of divine goodness, this truly excellent man, who from his cradle had been taught to see the hand of God in every thing, was most deeply sensible.

In the autumn of the year 1778, Mr. L. was seized with a violent fever which for some days excited the greatest alarm among his friends, lest they should lose their revered and beloved instructor. During this trying occasion, the posture of his mind was most pious and becoming. A short period after his recovery it was, that Mr. Belsham, at that time an Orthodox Minister of a congregation in the country, heard Mr. Lindsey. The subject of the sermon was a good conscience, and Mr. B. left the chapel impressed with the conviction that it was *possible* for a Socinian to be a good man, though his mind shrank with horror from the views which Unitarians entertained. In the autumn of 1792, Dr. Disney, then a Rector in Lincolnshire, informed Mr. L. of his intention to resign his situation in the Church, and offering to unite with him in officiating to the congregation in Essex-street. Nothing could be more agreeable to Mr. L. than this proposal, for he had been long anxious to procure an assistant pastor. The Trustees of the Chapel cordially concurred with the wishes of their beloved minister, who, with his usual liberality, offered his colleague, who had a family, a certain income nearly equal to that which he had resigned.

In the spring of 1783, Mr. L. being now more at liberty, committed to the press a work the materials of which he had been collecting some years. This work is entitled, "An Historical View of the State of the Unitarian Doctrine and Worship from the Reformation to our Own Times; with some Account of the Obstructions it has met with at Different Periods." This is an elaborate work, and one of the most interesting and important of Mr. L.'s publications. In the year 1786, Mr. Lindsey published an Examination of Mr. Robinson's (of Cambridge) Plea for the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ. The impression made upon the mind of the author of the Plea was very considerable. Some time after we find him writing in a letter

to a friend: "There are three divine persons in the Unity of the Godhead! Absolute nonsense! supported by tyranny over men's consciences." It is not quite clear to what distance from the standard of Orthodoxy this ingenious man carried his speculations upon the subject of the person of Christ. But "for many years," says one of Mr. R.'s family and congregation, in a letter to Dr. Priestley, "but especially for the last two or three of his life, he taught the doctrine of the Unity of the great Cause of all things, expressly and effectually." And in a letter to Dr. Priestley, "I am indebted to you," Mr. Robinson himself says, "for the little I know of rational, defensible Christianity. But for your friendly aid I should have gone from enthusiasm to Deism; but a faith founded on evidence rests on a rock."

In the year 1786, the dissenting academical institutions at Exeter, Warrington and Hoxton, having been dissolved, some gentlemen in London formed a plan for erecting a college in the vicinity of London, for the purposes of general education, and to supersede the necessity of sending the sons of dissenting parents to the English Universities, where they were under an obligation of subscribing to Articles which they did not believe. Of this institution Mr. Lindsey was from the beginning a sincere well-wisher, and an active and liberal supporter. In the year 1791 was formed the Unitarian Society for promoting Christian knowledge and the practice of virtue, by the distribution of books; and this Society he also sanctioned and promoted. Some years before Mr. L. retired from his office at Essex-street Chapel, his ministry was regularly attended by a nobleman of singular ingenuousness, rectitude, and liberality, the late Duke of Grafton. Early in the year 1793, Mr. L. at the time approaching the term assigned by the Sacred Writer as the limit of human life, resolved to resign his situation as a Christian minister. This he accordingly did, and on quitting the congregation, he preached a most judicious sermon. The time was now arrived when the subject of this memoir was destined to experience the severest privation which had ever yet fallen to his lot, by the exile into which the approved friend of

his heart, his fellow-labourer and fellow-sufferer in the cause of divine truth, Dr. Priestley, was driven by the lawless fury of an ignorant mob, and the connivance of the constituted authorities.

In the latter end of December, 1801, Mr. L. suffered a severe stroke, which at first excited the greatest apprehension. But from this he soon recovered, so as to be able to finish his last interesting work: "Conversations on the Divine Government; showing that everything is from God, and for good to all." This work exhibits a most interesting view of the ancient patriarch's pious, candid, benevolent, and cheerful mind; of his humble and devotional spirit; and of the happy influence of that rare combination of the principles of a sublime philosophy with the doctrines of pure and unsophisticated Christianity, which, when they become the ruling principles of conduct, elevate the human character to its highest dignity, and ensure the most substantial, exalted, and permanent felicity. Thus gently, thus usefully, did this eminent servant and minister of Christ pursue his way to that quiet abode, which is the house appointed for all living. For after the seizure before mentioned, he gradually declined in bodily strength and vigour. But no symptom of immediate danger appeared till the latter end of October, 1808, when he was attacked with a complaint that proved mortal. Mr. L. died in the 86th year of his age. Of his character, no long recapitulation can be necessary. It was what we might expect from a firm and intelligent believer in the final holiness and happiness of all men. Disinterested, glowing benevolence, springing from rational, ardent, and deep-rooted piety; supreme solicitude to discover truth; unwearied pains in searching after it, and inflexible firmness in what, after due inquiry, he believed to be right; just views of revealed religion, combined with earnest but not obtrusive zeal, for their promulgation; and blended with the most unaffected humility, and a singular courteousness of manner; finally and eminently, a commanding sense of God and duty, constituted the principal lineaments in the character of this excellent and truly venerable man.—*Trumpet.*

THE CHRISTIAN FREEMAN.

BY THE REV. JAMES KNAPTON.

BOLD and brave as the knights of yore
Who welcomed the faggot and flame;
Nobly the cross of their Master bore,
And died for his glorious name!

The soul of the Christian freeman is;
Though no longer the bigot's ire
Tempers the cup of his earthly bliss
With penance and sword and fire.

He rangeth the wide domains of truth,
Unfettered by human thrall;
Unmoved by the smile of earthly ruth,
He clings to the All in all.

With creed as broad as the Word of life,
And clear as the light of day,—
A heart with the treasures of wisdom rife,
He joyously wends his way.

And can he but hush, as he journeyeth on,
The sigh of some troubled breast,
Bereaved of all but the only One
Who giveth the mourner rest.

Can he but soothe the fainting mind,
By the hand of affliction riven,—
Balm for the weary in spirit find,—
He tasteth on earth his heaven.

Give me the Christian freeman's lot,
Whatever on earth betide,—
Give me his palace,—or give me his cot,—
Whatever I lack beside.

Give me the wreath that encircles his brow
Till the warfare of life is past;
The crown of bliss which he weareth now:
The crown he shall wear at last.

"APT TO TEACH."

BY REV. T. B. THAYER.

It is not only knowledge that one must have in order to teach successfully, but tact in communicating his knowledge to his scholars. We see many things clearly in our own thoughts, perfectly apprehend the principles involved in a question, and yet fail to make others see and apprehend, merely for the want of that faculty described so sententiously in the heading of this article—*aptness to teach*. Some men are like large ships, so heavily freighted, and drawing so much water, that they can not get to the

pier, and so have to be discharged of their cargo by lighters. They have treasures of knowledge, a vast magazine of facts, a world of information on a multitude of subjects; and yet when it comes to action they never seem to know how to use them. They cannot tell you what they want to know, and though they labour very earnestly to instruct you in the matter in hand, you are little wiser at the end than at the beginning.

Then on the other hand there are those who, though they know but very little on any special subject, have what they do know always at their command, ready for instant use; and they will interest you, and teach you more on the subject in one hour than the other will in five, though he may know five times as much. This is the difference between tact and talent, between much knowledge without, and little knowledge with "aptness to teach."

This difference is well worthy the consideration of Sunday School teachers, and the causes should invite a careful review from them. It is not needful to give less attention to the knowledge necessary to teach, but it *is* needful to give more attention to the manner and method of conveying the truths and moral precepts of religion to children. They must be interested in order to give the best effect to the instruction; and they are not likely to be so with the teaching of mere abstraction of doctrine or morality.

A story, a narrative, a parable will sometimes do more than a hundred exhortations without any illustration of the precept or principle involved. The example of the Saviour is directly to the point, and shows how the method of teaching truth must be adapted to the capacities and circumstances of the taught. The gospels recording his teachings abound in parables, in narratives which convey the truth and illustrate it in actual life at the same time. And how deeply the people were interested, how profound their attention, and how direct the influence on their faith and conduct!

Now the Sunday School teacher may learn from the greatest of all teachers the best method of imparting the divine lessons of his religion. He must not depend on the simple statement of a doctrine or a command in words, but

show the thing itself in life, in the conduct and action of men and women. Let the principle be personified as Wisdom is in the Scriptures, and Charity, and Love, and Righteousness, and Mercy, and Evil, and Sin, and Death.

Substitute in the place of mere exhortation an allegory, an apologue or parable, a sketch from history or biography; some story or tradition, an anecdote or incident illustrative of the truth or precept you wish to inculcate. Let the child see the principle acted out in human life: see that the thing you wish him to do has been done by others; that the thing you wish him to avoid has led others into danger and misery. He will remember the narrative, the fact embodied, years after mere words have been forgotten—nay, in many cases he will carry the lesson of the story through life as a power for good, when any abstract statement would have died from his thoughts before he had left the Church.

The teacher then should not only be doctrinally informed, and well instructed in the precepts of religion, but he should train himself in the most acceptable manner of teaching these. He should read much in the Bible to learn the method of divine instruction; he should read the history of nations, and religious biography, and travels, natural history, and science, that he may be able to draw from these such incidents and facts and illustrations as will fix the truth in the memory of his scholars. In this way they will return to the lesson oftentimes during the week; and, repeating to themselves the story, the truth will get firmly rooted in their thoughts and heart, and be with them through all the years of the future as the presence of an angel.

ILLUSTRATIONS.

As an example, *for parents*, of the manner in which the incidents of the passing day may be improved to impart the most beautiful and important truths—and as an example, *for teachers*, of the narrations by which the idea, the meaning and fitness of prayer may be taught to children, I append the following anecdote:

A MOTHER'S LESSON ON PRAYER.—A mother, sitting in her parlour, overheard her child, whom a sister was dressing, say repeatedly, "No, I don't want to say my prayers."

"Mother," said the child, appearing at the parlour.

"Good morning, my child."

"I am going to get my breakfast."

"Stop a minute, I want you to come and see me first."

The mother laid her work down on the next chair as the boy ran toward her. She took him up. He kneeled in her lap, and laid his face down upon her shoulder, his cheek against her ear. The mother rocked her chair backward and forward slowly—"Are you pretty well this morning?" said she, in a kind and gentle tone.

"Yes, mother, I am very well."

"I am glad you are well. I am very well too; and when I waked up this morning, and found that I was well, I thanked God for taking care of me."

"Did you?" said the boy in a low tone—half a whisper. He paused after it—conscience was at its work.

"Did you ever feel my pulse?" asked his mother, after a minute of silence, at the same time taking the boy down and setting him in her lap, and placing his finger on her wrist.

"Yes," said the child.

"If it should stop beating I should die."

"Should you?"

"Yes, I can't keep it beating."

"Who can?"

"God!" A silence. "You have a pulse too, which beats here in your bosom, in your arm, and all over you, and I cannot keep it from beating, nor can you—nobody but God. If he should not take care of you, who could?"

"I don't know," said the child, with a look of anxiety; and another pause ensued.

"So when I waked this morning, I thought I'd ask God to take care of me and all of us."

"Did you ask him to take care of me?"

"No, not you particularly."

"Why not?"

"Because I thought you would ask him yourself."

A long pause ensued—the deep and the thoughtful expression of his countenance showed that his heart was reached.

"Don't you think you had better ask him yourself?"

"Yes," said the boy, readily.

He kneeled again in his mother's lap, and uttered in his simple and broken

language, a prayer for the protection of Heaven.

And here is another illustration showing how a little thought as to the *manner* of teaching, will help to enforce the most important lessons in a way never to be forgotten.

A PARABLE.—"Oh, dear! I am so tired of a Sunday!" So said Willie, a playful little boy, who was longing for the Sabbath to be over, that he might return to his amusements.

"Who wants to hear a story?" said a kind friend who was present. "I, sir!"

"And I!" "And I!" said the children, as they gathered around him. Then he told them a parable. Our Saviour, when he was on earth, often taught the people by parables.

The parable told the little boys was of a kind man who had some very rich golden apples hanging upon a tree. A poor man was passing by the house of the owner, and he stopped to admire this beautiful apple-tree. He counted these ripe golden pippins; there were just seven of them. The rich owner could afford to give them away: and it gave him so much pleasure to make this poor man happy that he called him, and said, "My friend, I will give you a part of my fruit." So he held out his hand and received six of the apples. The owner had only kept one for himself.

Do you think the poor man was grateful for his kindness? No, indeed. He wanted the seven pippins all for himself. And at last he made up his mind that he would watch for his opportunity, and steal the other apple.

"Did he do that?" said Willie, very indignantly. "He had ought to have been ashamed of himself. And I hope he got well punished for stealing that apple."

"How many days are there in the week, Willie?" said his friend.

"Seven," said Willie, blushing deeply; for now he began to understand the parable. And he felt an uneasy sensation at his heart, as conscience began to whisper to him, "and ought not a boy to be ashamed of himself who is unwilling on the seventh day to lay aside his amusements? Ought he not to be punished if he will not remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy?"

CHURCH IN DANGER.

Not only is the Church of Rome in danger—her Sovereign Pontiff trembling on his throne—the Church of England is also in danger. Prelacy and Popery are alike fluttered and afraid. The Pope excommunicates; the Bishops condemn and inhibit. Strange spectacle! instructive coincidence! The two Churches most ingeniously guarded, fenced, and buttressed—hedged round about with creeds and forms—the one, never in the wrong; the other, always in the right—the two *Established Churches*—these Churches are both in danger! The times are against them. The armies of heaven fight not on their side. They must pass through the refiner's fire; they must be purged, and winnowed, and fashioned anew: and never until they are modelled after the pattern of the true, the primitive, the Christian Church, will they cease to be "in danger."

"Two things there be," says Milton (commencing his "Treatise of Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Causes"), "which have been ever found working much mischief to the Church of God and the advancement of truth; force on the one side restraining, and hire on the other side corrupting, the teachers thereof. Few ages have been, since the ascension of our Saviour, wherein the one of these two, or both together, have not prevailed. It can be at no time therefore unreasonable to speak of these things, since by them the Church is either in continual detriment and oppression, or in continual danger."

The Church of God knows nothing of force—nothing of appeals to Courts of Law to uphold its doctrines. Its appeals are made to "private judgment"—not in profession only, but in deed and in truth.

In comparison of that spiritual power by which Christ governs his Church, how uneffectual and weak (exclaims our great author) is outward force, with all her boisterous tools, to the shame of those Christians, and especially those Churchmen, who, to the exercising of Church discipline, never cease calling on the civil Magistrate to interpose his fleshly force—(an argument that all true

ministerial and spiritual power is dead within them)—who think the Gospel, which both begun and spread over the whole world, for above three hundred years, under heathen and persecuting emperors, cannot stand or continue, supported by the same divine power and protection to the world's end, much easier under the defensive favour only of a Christian Magistrate, unless it be enacted and settled, as they call it, by the State—a Statute or a State religion!

Nearly a hundred years (exactly nine decades) ago, a number of the clergy and laity of the English Church combined together to make it thoroughly Scriptural—to sweep away the creeds and articles, and substitute a simple declaration of assent to the sufficiency of the Bible. They framed a petition to Parliament in favour of this reformation, and placed it in the hands of Sir William Meredith, one of the then representatives of the city of Liverpool, who moved in the House of Commons that it might be brought up. Sir Roger Newdigate, Member for Oxford University, vehemently opposed the motion, introducing these scornful words in the course of his speech: "Some, perhaps, may ask what is the use of requiring subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles? All blind as they are, cannot they see that the Articles are barriers for the protection of the Church?"

Alas! "all blind as we are," we cannot see that the Articles preserve the National Church from danger. We see, despite those "barriers," that the Church is High, and Low, and Broad—and Neological, and Evangelical, and Romanistic. It was once asked, several years ago, in reply to a proposal to widen the pale of the Establishment, if the author of the scheme would wish to make the Church of England a "theological Noah's ark?" And lo! what else is she now?

Sir George Savile, alluding to Sir Roger Newdigate's words, replied:—"Some gentlemen talk of 'raising barriers about the Church of God, and protecting his honour!' language that is astonishing, that is shocking, that almost approaches to blasphemy. What! man—a poor, vile, contemptible reptile—talk of raising barriers about the Church of God! He might as well talk of protecting Omnipotent

tence, and raising barriers about his throne. Barriers about the Church of God, Sir? about that Church which, if there be any veracity in Scripture, shall continue for ever, and against which the gates of hell shall not prevail? * * The Church of God, Sir, can protect itself. Truth needs not be afraid of not obtaining the victory on a fair trial. The lovers of truth will love all sincere inquirers after it, though they may differ from them in various religious sentiments; for it is to impartial and free inquiry only, that error owes its ruin and truth its success. Those who are penetrated with the benevolent spirit of the Gospel, will not condemn as heretics, will not reject as unworthy of their affection, any who believe the Christian religion, who search and endeavour to understand the Scriptures, though they may be unable to comply with creeds and articles."

Even so. But if Churches make "creeds and articles" their foundations—if they base themselves, not on the Bible, but on Prayer Books, and require their ministers and teachers to subscribe forms of man's devising—they must also provide suitable means of keeping them to their engagements. They will find the task, no doubt, a difficult (if not a hopeless) one, and must be prepared to stand for ever "in danger;" while the Church of God and his Christ, founded upon a rock, will have no fear, but remain steadfast and unmoveable through the ages, surviving all the shocks and wrecks of time.

HURRIED DEVOTIONS.

PROBABLY many of us would be decomposed by an arithmetical estimate of our communion with God. It might reveal to us the secret of much of our apathy in prayer, because it might disclose how little we desire to be alone with God. We might learn from such a computation, that Augustine's idea of prayer, as "the measure of love," is not very flattering to us. We do not grudge the time given to a privilege which we love.

Why should we expect to enjoy a duty which we have no time to enjoy? Do we enjoy anything we do in a hurry? Enjoyment presupposes something of mental

leisure. How often do we say of a pleasure, "I wanted more time to enjoy it to my heart's content!" But of all enjoyments, none can be more dependent on "time for it," than *stated* prayer.

Fugitive acts of devotion, to be of high value, must be sustained by other approaches to God, deliberate, premeditated, regular, which shall be to those acts like the abutments of a suspension bridge to the arch that spans the stream. It will never do to be in desperate haste in laying such foundations. This *thoughtful* duty, this *spiritual* privilege, this foretaste of *uncorporeal* life, this communion with an unseen Friend—can you expect to enjoy it as you would a repartee or dance?

In the royal gallery at Dresden may be often seen a group of connoisseurs, who sit for hours before a single painting. They walk around those halls or corridors, whose walls are so eloquent with the triumphs of art, and they come back and pause again before that one masterpiece. They go away, and return the next day, and again the first and last object which charms their eye is that canvas, on which genius has pictured more of beauty than on any other in the world. Weeks are spent every year in the study of that one work of Raphael. Lovers of art cannot enjoy it to the full, till they have made it their own by prolonged communion with its matchless forms. Says one of its admirers, "I could spend an hour every day for years upon that assemblage of human and angelic and divine ideas, and on the last day of the last year discover some new beauty, and a new joy."

I have seen men standing in the street before an engraving of that gem of the Dresden gallery, a *longer* time than a good man will devote to his evening prayer. Yet, what thoughts, what ideals of grace can genius express in a painting, demanding time for their appreciation and enjoyment, like those great thoughts of God, of heaven, of eternity, which the soul needs to conceive vividly in order to know the blessedness of prayer? What conceptions can art imagine of the "Divine Child" which can equal in spirituality the thoughts which one needs to entertain of Christ in the "prayer of faith?"—*The Still Hour.*

CHANGES IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

Our young readers will be interested to see the curious changes which our language has undergone at different periods. These will be seen in the following specimens of the Lord's prayer at different periods:

[A.D., 1250.]

Fader our in heven, halewyed bethe thy nam, com thy kingeriche, thy wille bethe don in heven and in erthe. Our everich day breid gif ous to-day. And forghive ous our dettes, as we forghiven our dettours. And lede us nought into temptatioun, bot delyver our from ivil. Amen.

[A.D., 1300.]

Fadir our in heven, Halewyd be thi name, come thi kingdam. Thi wille be don, as in hevene and in erthe. Our uche dayes bred give us to-day. And forgive us our dettes, as we forgiven our dettours. And lede us not into temptatioun, Bote delyver us of yvel. Amen.

[A.D., 1379, Wickliffe's Bible.]

Our fadyr that art in heavenes, Halloed by thy name, Thy kingdom come to, Be thy will done in erthe as in heavene; Give to us this day our bread over other substaunces; And forgif to us our dettis as we forgiven to our detters; and leed us not into temptation; But deliver us from evel. Amen.

[A.D., 1526, Tindale's Testament.]

O oure father which art in heaven' halowed be thy name. Let thy kingdom come. Thy will be fulfilled' as well in erth' as hit ys in heven. Give vs this daye, our dayle breade. And forgive vs our treaspases even as we forgeve them which trespas vs. Leede vs not into temptation, but delyvre vs from yvell'. Amen.

[A.D., 1589, Coverdale's Bible.]

Our father which art in heauen, halowed be thy name.

Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done euen in erthe as it is in heauen.

Giue us this day our daily bread.

And forgiue us dettes as we also forgiue our detters. And lead us not into temptation, but delieuer us from euil: for thine is the kingdome and the power and the glorie for euer. Amen.

Now if you compare any of these with the prayer of our Lord in the sixth chapter of the Gospel by Matthew, you will see the difference between them and our present version.

SUCCESS IN LIFE.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN attributed his success as a public man, not to his talents or his powers of speaking—for these were but moderate—but to his known integrity of character. "Hence it was," he says, "that I had so much weight with my fellow-citizens. I was but a bad speaker, never eloquent, subject to much hesitation in my choice of words, hardly correct in language, and yet I generally carried my point." Character creates confidence in men in high station as well as in humble life. It was said of the first Emperor Alexander of Russia, that his personal character was equivalent to a constitution. During the wars of the Fronde, Montaigne was the only man among the French gentry who kept his castle gates unbarred; and it was said of him that his personal character was worth more to him than a regiment of horse. That character is power, is true in a much higher sense than that knowledge is power. Mind without heart, intelligence without conduct, cleverness without goodness, are powers in their way, but they may be powers only for mischief. We may be instructed or amused by them; but it is sometimes as difficult to admire them as it would be to admire the dexterity of a pickpocket or the horsemanship of a highwayman. Truthfulness, integrity, and goodness—qualities that hang not on any man's breath—form the essence of manly character, or as one of our old writers has it, "That inbred loyalty unto Virtue which can serve her without a livery." When Stephen, of Colonna, fell into the hands of his base assailants, and they asked him in derision, "Where is now your fortress?" "Here," was his bold reply, placing his hand upon his heart. It is in misfortune that the character of the upright man shines forth with the greatest lustre; and when all else fails he takes stand upon his integrity and his courage.

HOW TO MOVE IN THE WORLD.

ONE day a philosopher came to Athens, from a far country, to learn the ways of the wonderful Greeks, and perhaps to teach them the great lore he treasured in his heart. The wise men heard him; sought his company in the gardens; talked with him in private. The young men loved him. He passed for a wonder with that wonder-loving people. Among those that followed him, was the son of Sophroniscus, an ill-favoured young man, a mechanic of humble rank. He was one of the few that understood the dark, Oriental doctrines of the Sage, when he spoke of God, Man, Freedom, Goodness, of the Life that never dies. The young man saw these doctrines were pregnant with actions, and would one day work a revolution in the affairs of men, disinheriting many an ancient sin now held legitimate.

So he said to himself, when he saw a man rich or famous,—Oh, that I also were rich, and famous, I would move the world so soon. Here are sins to be plucked up and truths to be planted. Oh, that I could do it all, I would mend the world right soon. Yet he did nothing but wait for Wealth and Fame. One day the sage heard him complain with himself, and said, Young man, thou speakest as silly women. This Gospel of God is writ for all. *Let him that would move the world first move himself.* He that would do good to men begins with what tools God gives him, and gets more as the world gets on. It asks neither Wealth nor Fame to live a noble life, at the end of thy lane in Athens. Make thy Light thy Life; thy Thought, Action; others will come round. Thou askest a place to stand on hereafter and move the world. Foolish young man, take it where thou standest, and begin now. So the work shall go forward. Reform thy little self, and thou hast begun to reform the world. Fear not thy work shall die!

The youth took the hint; reformed himself of his coarseness, his sneers, of all meanness that was in him. His idea became his Life; and that blameless and lovely. His Truth passed into the public mind as the sun into the air. His Acorn is the father of the forest. His influence passes like morning, from continent to

continent, and the rich and the poor are blessed by the light and warmed by the life of Socrates, though they know not his name.—*Theodore Parker.*

CHURCH-RATE AND WATER-RATE.

IN one of those populous, yet primitive parishes, where Church-rates yet linger in the light of the latter half of the nineteenth century, a Dissenter was called upon by the worthy collector, and a dialogue ensued to the following effect.

Dissenter.—Good morning, Richard. Have you called for the rate?

Collector.—Yes, Sir; that's what I've come for.

Dissenter.—You call upon all alike, I suppose? You make no exceptions?

Collector.—Why, not exactly that, Sir. You see some won't pay, and it's no use calling upon them, so I only call where I think it likely I may get the rate.

Dissenter.—Oh, I see! But, pray, may I ask, do you make any exceptions in the water-rate?

Collector.—Ah! that's quite a different thing, Sir. *They all get something for that.*

Dissenter.—Just so. They get water for the water-rate; but many persons get nothing in return for the Church-rate, and object to pay.

Collector.—That's it, Sir.

Yes; that's it. It is the social wrong—the injustice of exacting from a man payment for the maintenance of a Church which he does not attend—making him pay for his neighbour's church, while he is already paying for his own—this it is which weighs with the practical English mind, and creates opponents of Church-rates among both Churchmen and Dissenters.

THE simple spiritual character of the Christian worship was, from the very first, a very singular and striking phenomenon to the heathens—particularly the fact that none of the outward pomp belonging to all other religions was to be found in it—"no temples, no altars, no images." When Celsus reproached the Christians with this, Origen replied, "In the highest sense God's temple and image are in the humanity of Christ; and consequently, in all believers who are actuated by the spirit of Christ—living statues, with which no Jupiter of Phidias is worthy to be compared!"—*Neander.*

"LET OTHER DOCTRINES ALONE."

BISHOP NEWTON once said, "My method for defeating error and heresy is by establishing the truth. One proposes to fill a bushel with tares, but if I can fill it first with wheat, then I shall certainly defeat his attempt." With a similar conviction and feeling, perhaps, there are those in our times who say, "preach your own belief, and let other doctrines alone. Preach the truth, and error, left to itself, MUST soon decline and die." Sometimes this advice, we believe, is timely and just, but sometimes, obviously, it is not. In many cases the bushel is already full of tares, and must be partially emptied, at least, before any wheat can possibly be put in. We may begin, and we ought to begin, with our own children at home, before they have mingled with the world, or are familiar with even the names of the various churches and creeds, and teach them the principles of our own faith; what we believe and think, without any reference whatever to other people's thoughts or views. Then the ground is unoccupied, and the soil ready for the seed. Let this opportunity slip, and you have a very different and more difficult task to perform. Men and women who have been in the world with their eyes open and their ears attent —to read, see, and hear—have already formed some opinions upon the different and conflicting doctrines that are held in the various branches of the Church. Their minds are not empty and clean, so that you can fill them up, as you would pour wheat into a barrel or bin. You are obliged to teach them, if at all, by comparison or contrast with what they now hold, or with what they have already seen and heard. By comparison, the leading features of the Catholic and Protestant systems of faith will always be most readily and thoroughly understood by the popular mind. We differ, and widely differ, in our doctrinal views, from the various denominations of the Evangelical School. Their doctrines are misunderstood and traduced. The most violent and bitter prejudices, in some communities, still prevail against them, and it is morally impossible to reach and move the popular mind, without the plainest exhibition of the principles of our faith, showing wherein we agree, and wherein we are compelled to dissent from the popular faiths. This course excites thought and inquiry, sends men to the Bible to read and search for themselves, makes them compare what they read with what they have been accustomed for years to hear and receive with scarce a question of doubt; and in almost numberless ways tends, as we can but think, to quicken the minds of men, and advance the religion of Christ in the world. Our Saviour certainly contrasted his doctrines with those taught by the Pharisees and Scribes, and this was one secret of his success, and may not we be allowed to follow the example without censure or reproach?

PLAIN DUTIES FROM OBSCURE TEXTS.

FALLING INTO GOD'S HANDS.

"It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God."—Heb. xi. 31.

There can be no doubt but the passage before us refers to falling under the *displeasure* of God. This was experienced by the Jews, and will be experienced by all who break the holy laws of God. There is no reference whatever in this text, or its context, that it is more fearful to fall into the hands of God in a future state of being than in this; we are always before the throne of God, always in his hands, and it is a fearful thing to be a rebel against so good and righteous a God as we have. Let us so order our lives that it may not be a fearful thing, but a delightful thing to feel we are in God's hands, and that our last, most devout, and hopeful prayer may be, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit."

YE SHALL DIE IN YOUR SINS.

"Then said Jesus unto them, I go my way; and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins; whither I go ye cannot come."—John viii. 21.

These words were addressed to the Jews, who were the enemies of Christ, and who sought him to distress him, and to take away his life. He intimates that he would soon be beyond their reach. These words were uttered a few days before his death: that death would place him where their malevolence could no more disturb him: "whither I go ye cannot come." The text does not intimate that those Jews would never be restored to God's favour, or to enjoy his company in a different frame of mind. He tells his pursuers that he is fast hastening to a place where the wicked will cease from troubling, and the weary be at rest. Ye desire a Messiah, none other shall be given to you. Ye shall die in your sins. The text does not necessarily imply they should never see him again, though they were his persecutors; for them he prayed, we hope not in vain. John xiii. 33. To his disciples he says, "Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye shall seek me; and as I said unto the Jews, Whither I go ye cannot come; so now I say unto you." This explanation, we hope, takes the hardness away from the text quoted. While the spirit of Christian life can be found, let us embrace it; men can become so hard in their hearts, and so lost to virtue here, that a prophet can truly say, "they will die in their sins." We do not take in hand to say what will then be the degree of their punishment, or its duration, before they see the face of Christ with joy. To-day, while it is to-day, let us seek the way of life.

TURNUED INTO HELL.

"The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God."—Psalms ix. 17.

It has been frequently admitted by learned Trinitarian commentators that the word (*sheol*) rendered hell has, for its primary signification, "grave;" "pit;" and its secondary meaning in

Scripture is severe *calamity, overthrow, misery, degradation*:—that the popular interpretation put on this word, *hell*, was unknown to the Bible writers. Christ says, "Thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto *heaven*, shall be brought down to *hell*." Exalted not literally to heaven, but in influence, prosperity, riches, power—it should be brought low, destroyed, brought down to hell. The Psalmist speaks of being himself encompassed about with the pains of hell. The wicked and all the nations that forget God shall have their overthrow, defeat, severe pain, and troubles—be brought down to the grave. And let us all understand there is no escaping this; if we renounce God and goodness, we will be turned into hell. A wicked mind, an ungodly state of life, itself is hell, and will remain so as long as the sin continues. "The kingdom of heaven is within you," said Christ; so is the power and misery of hell.

CHRIST AND THE SWORD.

"Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against the mother-in-law: and a man's foes shall be they of his own household."—Matthew x. 34.

This text, which appears to speak of Christ as introducing into the world and the social circle all the confusion and animosity of strife and war, has not a little perplexed many readers; for it has appeared so inconsistent with the other representations of him as the Prince of Peace. The true principles of Christianity are peace and righteousness; animosity, strife, war, are incidental to the diffusion of those principles. Sin is the primary cause of all war, not holiness; tyranny has been at the root of most of the battles that have been fought, though the champions of liberty were blamed for the conflict. Christianity speaks for human freedom and righteousness, for the worship of the one true God, and justice to universal man. Many a serious conflict will the world behold before those rights are secured, and truth and goodness have won the earth to themselves. Christ foresaw this, and spoke these words. Many of the Jews expected that the reign of the Messiah would be one of grand prosperity and universal peace. Christ was not backward to declare to his disciples that it would not be all peace; that they would have to meet with and endure persecution. Brother would deliver brother to death, and children would rise up and accuse their parents. That strife and the most deadly animosities would be excited. That their mission would cause war, and so it has been. The sword was drawn to destroy the principles of Christianity in the bud; it did not triumph then against it, nor will it ever do so. Christ has said, that when we hear of wars, and rumours of war, we may comfort ourselves the end is not yet. The end which God designed by the mission of Christ was peace on earth and good-will among men. Though the sword has its mission—a fearful one—let us understand that the

blessing of God rests on the peacemakers; they who reconcile their enemies, and make them friends, not by carnal weapons, but by moral suasion and goodness of life. They who can arbitrate the differences of disputants, and allay the angry feelings of opponents, are the true soldiers of Jesus Christ. The sword is not the regenerator of society, as too many falsely suppose; it is only a punitive agent, as is famine and pestilence. The truths of the gospel, and nothing else, will at last put up the sword, to be no more drawn for ever.

"THE REASONABLENESS OF EVER-LASTING PUNISHMENT."

An American Minister, the Rev. Dr. ADAMS, has written a tract on the "Reasonableness of Everlasting Punishment," which has been ably reviewed, and replied to, in the "*Monthly Journal*," the substance of which notice we now place before our readers.

THE different views concerning the future state, held by the Christian Church, may be thus classified, arranging them, exhaustively, under eight divisions:—

I. The Roman Catholic Church makes three conditions hereafter, viz.:

1. Everlasting joy.
2. Everlasting suffering.
3. Temporal sorrow in purgatory.

II. The orthodox Protestant Church makes two conditions hereafter, viz.:

1. Infinite and eternal joy.
2. Infinite and eternal suffering.

III. The Old-school Universalists make one condition hereafter, viz.:

1. Eternal joy.

IV. New-school Universalists, and Restorationists, make two conditions hereafter, viz.:

1. Eternal joy.
2. Temporal and finite suffering.

V. Unitarians make an indefinite number of conditions hereafter, according to the various characters and moral states of men.

VI. The Swedenborgians make an indefinite but limited number of heavens and hells, suited to the varieties of character, but having a supernatural origin.

VII. The Spiritualists make the other world like this world, with no essential differences, making it a continuation of the natural life.

VIII. The Annihilationists believe that the finally impenitent will perish wholly, and come to nothing.

This statement includes all, or nearly all, of the views held in the Christian Church concerning the condition of departed souls in the other world. We do not propose to examine them all at the present time; but we shall examine at some length one of them. This is the doctrine which declares that there are but two conditions after death, both permanent and unchangeable; and that the condition of those who are not converted to Christ in this world is a condition of eternal misery in the other, without pause, change, or alleviation. This, being the orthodox, and only orthodox view of most Protestants—

of Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Methodists, Baptists—deserves a careful examination. Multitudes in these sects disbelieve it; but it is in all their standards, and belongs to their fundamental and essential doctrines. For some cause or other, there is evidently an energetic attempt made in some quarters to revive the decaying belief in the doctrine of everlasting punishment in the future state, as a penalty for the sins of this. The reasons for this new effort to support this terrific doctrine are probably to be found in a wide-spread and increasing disbelief concerning it, pervading the churches nominally orthodox. This has come from the growing intelligence, and progressive movements of thought, in the Christian Church. The evidences of this belief are numerous and increasing. Those who reject the orthodox view are a very numerous body, but divided into several parties. There are the old-fashioned Universalists—a valiant race, men of war from their youth—who, under the lead of such men as Hosea Ballou and Thomas Whittemore, have spent their lives in fighting the doctrine of everlasting punishment. Very naturally, perhaps, they went to the opposite extreme of opinion, and denied all future suffering. But this view has, we think, ceased to be the prevailing one among the Universalists. The doctrine of ultimate restoration has very generally taken its place. This doctrine also prevails widely in other denominations; not only among the Liberal bodies, like the Unitarians, but also among Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists. This view has widely spread, as is well known, in Germany. It was held by Schleiermacher, the father of modern German theology. It tinges the writings of such orthodox men as Tholuck, Hahn, and Olshausen. Others profess to believe in everlasting punishment, but make it a merely negative consequence of lost time and opportunity; one will be always worse off hereafter in consequence of the neglect of duty. Others follow Swedenborg, and make the sufferings of hell rather agreeable than otherwise to those who bear them.

In consequence of this wide-spread disaffection toward the orthodox doctrine, it has naturally happened that attempts have been made to defend it anew. Some of these attempts are before us, and we propose to examine one or more of them now.

It has long seemed to us that the views held by Unitarians on this subject were far too indefinite and undecided. It is quite as important a question in the theology as that of the Trinity; if the last affects the nature of God, this bears on the character of God. It seems to us impossible to hold the common doctrine on this subject, without having the Gospel view of the Divine character essentially shaken; it is not possible to regard him as a Being in whom love is the essential attribute. If this is so, as we shall presently undertake to prove, it becomes a matter of vital importance that the doctrine should be disproved and rejected. It is not enough that it should be quietly laid aside; it is due to the truth, that it should be distinctly and fully confuted. For this doctrine, if it be false, is deeply

dishonourable to God. It takes away his highest glory; it substitutes fear of him, in the place of love, in the human heart; it neutralizes the peculiar power of the Gospel; it degrades the quality of Christian piety, and poisons religion in its fountain.

For what is this doctrine, as it is taught at the present day in all orthodox churches, and as it stands in all orthodox creeds? It is, that the moment of death decides, and decides for ever the destiny of man; that those who die impenitent, unbelieving, and unconverted, are for ever lost, without the possibility of return; that those thus lost are to suffer for ever and ever, without end, the most grievous torments in soul and body. These torments consist in banishment from the presence of God, and positive sufferings, in addition thereto, of an awful kind. Precisely what they are, it is not, perhaps, necessary for an orthodox man to believe. There is no orthodox definition which is authoritative on that point; and considerable range, therefore, is allowable. The suffering may be that of literal fire, or it may not. It may be physical suffering, or the pangs of conscience, the absence of love, and the sense of emptiness. On these points there is some liberty of opinion, doubtless. But we presume that it would not be orthodox to admit a preponderance, in hell, of good over evil, or to admit with Swedenborg the existence of pleasure there, even though it be only a diabolical and sinful pleasure. The doctrine of orthodoxy certainly is, that evil predominates over good, and pain over pleasure, in the condition of the damned; so that their existence is a curse, and not a blessing. Especially is hope shut out; there is no hope of return, no possibility of escape, no chance of repentance, even at the end of myriads of years. The man who is condemned to imprisonment for life, in solitary confinement, is in an unfortunate condition; but he has hope—hope of escape, hope of pardon—sure hope, at all events, of deliverance one day, by death, from his condition, and a change to something better, or at least to something different. But in the orthodox opinion there is no such alleviation as this to the suffering of the future state.

It is usual, we know, for many orthodox preachers to intensify in description the sufferings of the future state, and to task their imagination for multiplied pictures of horror; but we will make no use of this fact in our argument against the doctrine, since the doctrine does not require it. We merely assume that orthodoxy asserts a preponderance of evil over good in the other world, and that this preponderance is to be continued without end—for ever. Let us see what this means:

It means that the sufferings to be endured hereafter by each individual soul, as a punishment for sins committed in this world, will infinitely exceed in amount all the suffering borne on the surface of the earth, by its total population, from the creation of Adam to the destruction of the world. Each lost soul will suffer not only more, but infinitely more than all the accumulated sufferings of the human race throughout all time. We shudder as we read

the account of the sufferings from hydrophobia, or the burning alive of a slave at the South, or the tortures inflicted by the Holy Inquisition, or the horrors of a field of battle, or the cruelties inflicted by savages upon their victims; but all of these, added together, are finite, and the sufferings of a single soul hereafter are infinite. That is to say, all the pain and evil of this world, resulting from all human sin, through all time, is infinitely small and insignificant, when compared with the punishment endured by a single soul hereafter for his share of that sin. And all this is inflicted by God; and he is a God of love.

There are some doctrines the statement of which is their refutation. This, we think, is one of them.

But it must also be considered that this doctrine, which throws such darkness over the future, also sends down a rayless night over the present. It refutes every theodicee; it nullifies every solution of evil. The consolation for the sufferings of this world is, that the fashion of this world passes away, and that there is a better world to come. The explanation of the evils of this life is, that they are finite; and that they are, therefore, to be swallowed up and to disappear in an infinite good. The Christian finds relief in considering the sufferings of this world, by regarding them as the means of greater ultimate joy; by looking forward to the time when all tears shall be wiped away; and by a firm faith that love is stronger than selfishness, good stronger than evil. But the doctrine of eternal punishment gives us, in the condition of a single lost soul, a greater amount of evil hereafter than all the evil which is to be thus explained here; and the myriads of lost souls, each of which is to suffer infinitely more than all the sufferings of the present world, present us with a problem in the future so appalling, that the problem of present evil, vast as it is, becomes insignificant by its side.

We are tormented with evil here. We seek a solution of the problem; we find it in the limited, finite, and ancillary nature of evil. But that solution is wholly taken away when we are told that evil is infinite and eternal.

Against such a view of future punishment there are certainly grave antecedent objections, on grounds both of reason and of Scripture. The burden of proof is upon those who believe and teach it. It is a doctrine shocking to the common sense and common humanity of the world. It seems to impute injustice and cruelty to the Infinite Father; it seems to stand in contradiction of the idea of God given us by Christ. It cannot be defended by argument; it must rest, one would think, entirely on the basis of Scripture. There are a few passages of Scripture which seem at first sight, and in their literal signification, to teach it; were it not for these, it certainly would not be believed. It becomes us, therefore, carefully to examine these passages, and see what they really teach; and we shall do this before concluding the present article.

(To be continued.)

NOTES FROM SALE'S INTRODUCTION TO THE KORAN.

THEY (of the Sabian religion) do not only believe in one God, but produce many strong arguments for his unity. . . . They endeavour to perfect themselves in the four intellectual virtues, and believe the souls of wicked men will be punished for 9,000 ages, but will afterwards be received to mercy (p. 10).

Among the Arabs it was the heresies of Ebion, Beryllus, and the Nazareans, and also that of the Collyridians were broached, or at least propagated: the latter introduced the Virgin Mary for God, or worshipped her as such. . . .

This notion of the divinity of the Virgin Mary was also believed by some at the Council of Nice, who said there were two Gods besides the Father, namely, Christ and the Virgin Mary. Others imagined her to be exempt from humanity, and deified, which goes but little beyond the Popish superstition in calling her the complement of the Trinity, as it were imperfect without her. This foolish imagination is justly condemned in the Koran as idolatrous, and gave a handle to Mohammed to attack the Trinity itself.

In treating of the future duration of punishment, Sale says, "It is a received opinion of the Jews that none, be he ever so bad, shall remain in hell above eleven months, except Dathan, and Abiram, and atheists, and they are there for ever." Mohammed believed that none but infidels will be in hell for ever. That believers would be exposed to hell for their sins not less than nine hundred years, and not more than seven thousand, after which they would be restored.

Mohammed, it is certain, had considerable knowledge of the Old and New Testament. The religion of the ancient patriarchs and prophets, he thought, he could restore by his professed revelations. SALE (Trinitarian) believes that he changed his countrymen for the better, and that his aversion to the Christians of his age arose entirely from the perversions and corruptions of Christianity that then prevailed. "The damage done by Mohammed to Christianity seems to have been rather owing to his ignorance than malice: for his great misfortune was not having a competent knowledge of the real and pure doctrines of the Christian religion, which was in his time (the seventh century) so abominably corrupted, that it is not surprising if he went too far, and resolved to abolish what he might think incapable of reformation."

Sale says, "The Mohammedans say there is a bridge o'er which all mankind must attempt to pass—Al Sirat—laid o'er the midst of hell, and described to be finer than a hair, and sharper than the edge of a sword, beset on either side with briars and hooked thorns; these will be no impediment to the good—they will pass o'er with swiftness and ease,—whereas the wicked will be entangled and fall headlong into the gulf gaping beneath them."

[Terror appears the one grand agency of the Moslem faith.]

WAYSIDE GATHERINGS.

A CAUTIOUS REPLY.—A Connecticut school-master asked a lad from Newport, "How many Gods are there?" After scratching his head some time, the boy replied, "I don't know how many you have in Connecticut, but we have only one in Rhode Island."

PUBLIC PRAYER.—Whitfield is credited by some one with saying that an American divine "prayed him into a good frame, and then prayed him out of it again." The rule of Dr. Emmons to his pupils in theology was, "Never let your prayer exceed ten minutes in length."

THE DUKE—THE MADIAT.—A few years ago Leopold, Duke of Tuscany, imprisoned the Madiat for circulating a few copies of the Word of God. To-day the Duke is a fugitive from his kingdom, and the Madiat are busily engaged in circulating the Scriptures, the Provisional Government of Tuscany having proclaimed freedom of conscience.

HOW CLERGYMEN CAME TO WEAR BLACK.—In the year 1524, Luther laid aside the monk's costume, and henceforth dressed according to the fashion of the world. He chose black clothes, and consequently that colour has become the fashion of the clergy. His reason for choosing this colour was, the Elector of Saxony took an interest in him, and now and then sent him a piece of black cloth, being at that time the Court fashion; and because Luther preferred it, his scholars thought it became them to wear the same colour as their master. From that time, black has been the colour mostly worn by the clergy.

WILL WORK BOTH WAYS.—"It's a poor rule," the old adage runs, "that won't work both ways." We may apply this adage to a theological point. It is said that the wicked man *deserves* endless misery, that man requires endless punishment. If this be true, will not the rule work the other way, and may we not, with equal propriety, affirm that the good man *deserves* endless life, and that virtue can claim an *eternal reward*? The last nobody believes. No one supposes that men can merit or earn an eternal heaven, and why could we suppose that men can merit or deserve an *eternal hell*? The rule must work both ways, or not at all.

TRIALS PRODUCTIVE OF GOOD.—"I remember," says Mr. Whitfield, "some years ago, when I was at Shields, I went into a glass-house; and standing very attentive I saw several masses of burning glass, of various forms. The workman took a piece of glass and put it into one furnace, then he put it into a second, and then into a third. I said to him, 'Why do you pass this through so many fires?' He answered, 'Sir, the first was not hot enough, nor the second, and therefore we put it into a third; and that will make it transparent.'" This furnished Mr. W. with a useful hint, that we must be tried, and exercised with many fires, until our dross be purged away, and we are made fit for the owner's use.

PROGRESS.—In 1552, during the reign of Edward VI., books of astronomy were destroyed, as being infected with magic.

THE RIGHT QUESTION.—To an unbiased thinker, obviously, the most pressing inquiry is not, Whence came I?—is not, Whither go I?—but is, Being here, what am I to do?

GOOD BOOKS.—"Good books! written in the olden time, of man's untrammelled thinking—and read, studied, admired, and almost adored by a hundred generations, are indeed blessings."

A TOO LITERAL HEARER.—"Father, I think you told a lie in the pulpit this morning," said the little son of a clergyman. "Why, what do you mean?" "Sir, you said, '*one more word and I have done.*' Then you went on and said a great many more words. The people expected you'd leave off, 'cause you promised them; but you didn't, and kept on preaching a long while after the time was up."

REMEMBER THE POOR.—Unitarianism has become seriously contaminated by false pride. Everything in connection with Unitarianism must be *no plus ultra*; the services of the congregations must be exquisite, their preaching unsurpassed, their churches most magnificent, the people rich and highly intellectual. If these elements cannot be brought together, then we hear it said that it is not worth while to attempt to attend or sustain a Unitarian Church. Such, we fear, has been the cause of the slow progress of Unitarianism in Philadelphia; and if not here, it is the cause of stagnation in many other cities of the Union. We must return to first principles, if we desire to prosper—adhere to Christian simplicity, to brotherly love, be willing to make sacrifices for the truth, and be frank and avowed Unitarians under all circumstances.—*Christian Inquirer.*

THE RESURRECTION.—"I do not believe," said Skeptic, one day, "that ever a man was raised from the dead." "This," replied Faith, "is incredible to you; but to me it is no more surpassing belief than the truth that to the first man God gave form and life, or to you and me the boon of existence. I can not tell how God raised the Saviour from the tomb; neither can I tell how, when there was no man on earth, he made Adam, or how he brought you and me from the blank, behind our own history, and so favoured us with the opportunity and power to fill out this record of life to the present time. Nevertheless, I have a firm belief in the resurrection of Jesus, based on the record which those who knew him have made of that event, as I have a firm belief in our own beginning, based on the experience which we have thus far wrought out. I say often to myself: Since I live, and can tell the number of my years, I believe that God created me. I marvel at the power that did this work, but I will not be one to say, there is no God, or, I was not created. I say often to myself, too, since Jesus lives, I shall live also."